LIBRARY FEB 10 1958

SOCIAL SCIENCES

NATIONAL REVIEW

25 Cents

February 15, 1958

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

Max Lerner's America

RAYMOND ENGLISH

The Supreme Court on Internal Security

MARIAN STEPHENSON

The Americas: A Fable in Reverse

GEORGE F. CARTER

Articles and Reviews by · · · · E. v. KUEHNELT-LEDDIHN
FRANK S. MEYER · GARRY WILLS · L. BRENT BOZELL
REVILO OLIVER · RUSSELL KIRK · ANTHONY LEJEUNE

For the Record

Middle-East observers insist the Soviets engineered the Syria-Egypt merger, with oil as the contemplated "spoils." On the eve of the merger, President Al-Kuwatly of Syria formally accepted a luxurious 32-seat personal airliner, complete with office and bedroom, from the Soviet Union . . . . Across Asia, the Soviets are increasingly concerned with the vigor of Japan's economic recovery. Japanese Communist elements are being urged to undertake all possible disruptive activities to slow down the Soviets' historic enemy in the Far East.

Lobbyists for Alaskan statehood now are confident that Alaska will be voted the 49th state at this session of Congress, and will send one Republican and one Democratic Senator to Congress in the fall elections . . . . Washington intimates of Senator H. Alexander Smith expect him to change his mind for the fourth time and re-enter the New Jersey primary fight within the next two weeks . . . . Since 1954 there has been a mass exodus from Communist China. On the destinations of these freedom-seeking subjects of Mao Tse-tung, the statistics read: non-Communist nations, four million; Communist nations, zero . . . . A first-class mail rate increase from three to four cents now seems a certainty.

With Explorer in orbit and successful recent launchings of a half dozen missile types, Democratic Party tacticians are beginning to fear that their decision to make Republican failures in defense the major issue for the autumn election campaign may boomerang. Some are arguing for a switch from Weapons to Disarmament and Peace.

The decision has been made by the Republican high command to take a tough approach in the campaign. Eisenhower will be permitted to talk softly and in abstractions, but everyone else will follow the cue of Sherman Adams in Minneapolis . . . . One top Republican figure in New York is quoted as saying that the Nelson Rockefeller boomlet is over —that Rockefeller probably can be appointed to any post he wants, but couldn't be elected to one.

Harvard's Nieman (practicing journalists) Fellows for 1958: Harry Ashmore of the Little Rock Gazette (Liberal tractarian) and Mark Ethridge of the Louisville Courier-Journal (Liberal tractarian). Yet to be selected: a conservative journalist.

NATIONAL REVIEW

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

EDITOR: Wm. F. Buckley Jr.

PUBLISHER: William A. Rusher

EDITORS

L. Brent Bozell — James Burnham
John Chamberlain — Whittaker Chambers
Willmoore Kendall — Suzanne La Follette
Frank S. Meyer

PRODUCTION EDITOR: Mabel Wood

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT: Sam M. Jones

ASSOCIATES

Maureen L. Buckley — Priscilla L. Buckley
Jonathan Mitchell — Morrie Ryskind

CONTRIBUTORS

C. D. Batchelor, John C. Caldwell, Frank Chodorov, John Abbot Clark, Forrest Davis, A. Derso, Max Eastman, Medford Evans, Karl Hess, John D. Kreuttner, J. B. Matthews, Gerhart Niemeyer, Revilo Oliver, E. Merrill Root, Richard M. Weaver, Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, Garry Wills

FOREIGN CONTRIBUTORS

London: Anthony Lejeune — *Madrid*: J. Dervin
Munich: E. v. Kuehnelt-Leddihn

ASSISTANT TO THE PUBLISHER: J. P. McFadden

CONTENTS FEBRUARY 15, 1958 VOL. V, NO. 7

THE WEEK 147

ARTICLES

The Americans: A Fable in Reverse — George F. Carter 155
The Supreme Court on Security — Marian Stephenson 159

DEPARTMENTS

For the Record 146
National Trends ..... L. Brent Bozell 152
Letter from London ..... Anthony Lejeune 154
Letter from Siam .... E. v. Kuehnelt-Leddihn 158
Principles and Heresies ..... Frank S. Meyer 160
From the Academy ..... Russell Kirk 161
To the Editor 166

BOOKS, ARTS, MANNERS

Max Lerner's America ..... Raymond English 162
Mythological Mud Pies ..... Revilo Oliver 163
Two Films from Europe ..... Garry Wills 164
Books in Brief 165

VERSE

Call of the Jungfrau ..... Johannes Eff 156

NATIONAL REVIEW is published weekly, except the second and third weeks in August, by National Weekly, Inc.

Copyrighted 1958 in the U.S.A. by National Weekly, Inc.

Second-class mail privileges authorized at Orange, Conn.

EDITORIAL AND SUBSCRIPTION OFFICES:
211 East 37th St.
New York 16, N.Y.
Telephone MUrray Hill 2-0941

RATES: Twenty-five cents a copy, $8.00 a year, $15.00 for two years. Foreign, $10.00 a year; Canada, $9.00 a year.

The editors cannot be responsible for unsolicited manuscripts unless return postage, or better, a stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed. Opinions expressed in signed articles do not necessarily represent the views of the editors.

The WEEK

● From the *New York Times* no less, and an article by Thomas J. Hamilton none other, and under, of all things, a headline that summarizes it accurately: "As the last eleven years have demonstrated, the United Nations can take action only if the United States and the Soviet Union are in agreement. . . . The debates in the General Assembly will continue to provide useful information on what the world thinks. But the capabilities of the United Nations for settling great issues have now been established, and it will be surprising if the organization acts as more than a sounding board in the years of decision confronting the world." Couldn't have said it better—or in so many words—ourselves.

● It is interesting to reflect on the publicity that has been given to what appears to us to be no case whatever against John Charles Doerfer, chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. A "confidential" report by a congressional watchdog committee, insinuating malfeasance and personal profiteering by Mr. Doerfer, was ventilated in the front pages of even the respectable press. Now it develops that Mr. Doerfer has done nothing unusual, unlawful—or even questionable. But no one appears to be particularly put out by publicly ventilated doubts about his honesty caused by over-zealous investigations. It isn't as though he had been charged so irresponsibly with being a Communist.

● Before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, General Nathan F. Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, spoke of the dangers inherent in the "misapprehension" that the Soviet Union is currently stronger than the United States. Such a "mistaken conclusion," General Twining insisted, "increases the probability of total war" for it invites "bolder courses of Soviet action," weakens "the will of our allies," and—here General Twining surely meant to refer to what might be, rather than what is—leads "to fatal compromises in connection with disarmament negotiations and . . . other retreats in the foreign policy field."

● Because Congress was not in session at the time he was appointed, it was not until two weeks ago that William P. Rogers appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee as a preliminary to his formal confirmation as Attorney General. We do not yet know what was asked of Mr. Rogers by the Senators charged with supervising the Department of Justice, but we learn that Mr. Rogers was *not* asked anything about the strange disposition of the tax case against Adam Clayton Powell Jr. Possibly the Senators were afraid to bring up the matter—the vindictiveness of Mr. Powell is legendary; or perhaps they were intimidated by the Administration. The fact is, Mr. Rogers got through the hearing without having to answer the one question that, it is widely known, would manifestly have embarrassed him. One marvels at the influence of Powell-cum-Republicanism. It appears to be a force that can make just about anybody keep his mouth sh. . . . glug . . .

● Calling all students of public relations. Study carefully the job being done for Nelson Rockefeller as Governor in New York. You may live a hundred years and not see its equal.

● Some of the top level officials of the State Department's permanent staff, rated among Washington's most accomplished knifers, are making one more effort to cut the President's disarmament officer, Harold E. Stassen, off the White House payroll. They are, at the moment, trying a classic thrust: a rumor from "authoritative sources", spread via cooperative journalists, that (as James Reston of the *New York Times* obligingly put it last week) Mr. Eisenhower "has decided to accept [Stassen's] resignation, or to request it if Mr. Stassen does not submit it soon." It would be consoling but inaccurate to report that this attempt at political mayhem was prompted by disagreement with the hapless Mr. Stassen's unblemished record of appeasement while on official disarmament duty. The real motive would seem to be the determination of the State Department professionals to protect their monopoly of the nation's foreign policy operations, and to stop this meddling by temporary White House amateurs. If Mr. Stassen had been standing up firmly to his Moscow opposite numbers, he would be only the more juicy a target for the bureaucratic sharpshooters.

● WANTED: A Case History—of a bright and qualified young American boy who could not get into college in 1957 for failure to find scholarship aid. NATIONAL REVIEW wants to know where all the students are who, in the absence of a program of federal aid, are being deprived of the opportunity to develop demonstrated talents—and will pay the first three readers who send in case histories, ten dollars each.

● The glee with which the brave new era in Venezuela is being greeted in this country seems overplayed. The first tangible results of the overthrow of dictator Pérez Jiménez are: a) the return of leftist exiles vowing a tougher line toward U.S. "exploitation" and "interference"; b) a welcome net spread

for exiled Communists, two of whom were seated in the civilian junta that joined the military committee in taking over from Jiménez. It is to be expected that the hack Liberal journals should not grasp the threatening significance of such developments, but it is harder to understand why so sophisticated a magazine as the *New Leader*, a stronghold of socialist anti-Communism, should be so gushingly and uncritically anxious to claim the new Venezuelan regime as its own political baby.

● Mr. John E. Corette, president of the Montana Power Company, one of the constituent firms of the Pacific Northwest consortium formed to develop the Snake River power potential, warns that the Federal Power Commission's refusal to grant Pacific Northwest permission to go ahead with the Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley dams may signify a general retreat of the Eisenhower Administration before the offensive of the public power lobby. Appearing before the House of Representatives Interior Committee, public power advocates tried once more, a week ago, to reverse last year's FPC decision under which the Idaho Power Company is constructing three privately financed dams on another of the Snake River projects. The committee voted to postpone until June 2 action on this senseless proposal—the effect of which would be to junk the tens of millions worth of work already done, to saddle the nation's taxpayers with a half-billion-dollar debt, and to postpone for years the added power production that the region needs.

● The relative weakness of U.S. and South Korean forces *vis à vis* those of the Red Chinese and the North Koreans across the truce boundary was disclosed in a letter addressed by Congressman Daniel Flood of Pennsylvania to Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy. Representative Flood states that our ground troops and Air Force "are outnumbered three to one"; that whereas the "Red troops are equipped with the most modern tactical guided missile hardware," the "modernization of the two American divisions and of the ROK divisions has been seriously delayed." We hope that Secretary McElroy will lower his glance from outer space long enough to read Congressman Flood's warning.

● For the Record: Not even *two* hours with Edward R. Murrow and the television camera will make Harry Truman a) venerable, b) wise, c) informed, d) a successful President, or e) a successful ex-President. Under Mr. Truman we retreated from victory, depreciated the dollar by half, surrendered a third of the world to Communism, fought by his own decree the one war the nation did not win; marched headlong toward omnipotent government, and simultaneously aggrandized, and debased, the Presidential office.

● On the Common Denominator in the World's Great Revolutions: (From an address delivered by the Vice President of India, Sir S. Radhakrishnan, at Moscow University): "The great revolutions, the British, the French, the American and the Russian mark important stages in the progress of freedom. . . . They are all based on a conviction of the sanctity of the individual, the freedom to think, express and worship according to his conviction." In charity, let us be reminded that Sir Radhakrishnan needed safe passage out of the free USSR.

● Press release from the *Young Socialist* ("an independent socialist youth paper"): "The mounting [McCarthyite] hysteria has begun to melt." Could they have it wrong? Do they mean: the diminishing hysteria is beginning to freeze? Or: the onrushing hysteria has begun to soar? Or: the deafening hysteria has begun to trickle away? Or maybe the *Young Socialist* is getting the kind of writers socialism deserves. In which case let's try one *final* formulation: The quality of socialist prose is keeping pace with the prestige of socialism.

Your Children or Your Ideology

A reporter for the *New York World Telegram and Sun* described last week a scene in a New York public school classroom. As the class of thirty-odd sixteen-year-olds assembled, a boy entered the door and for an entire minute directed a stream of obscenities at the teacher. Having done so, he beckoned to a girl who was seated at her desk and, by an authoritative gesture, commanded her to join him in leaving the classroom, presumably to engage in more entertaining, non-academic pursuits. The teacher—a middle-aged woman—went to the door to detain the girl. The girl swore at the teacher and then lunged at her, tearing her clothing. With a parting glance of contempt, the young couple left the classroom, and went their way.

Under existing laws and school regulations: a) The teacher has no disciplinary recourse against the offending students. She cannot expel them from her class. She cannot punish them, or call upon others to punish them. She has no means of protecting herself from their abuse, or her class from a repetition of so demoralizing a spectacle. b) The parents whose lot it is to send their children to this particular school may not apply for a transfer to another, more orderly school, even assuming there were one within reach. Nor may the parents elect to keep their children at home on the grounds that attendance at school,

under the circumstances, tends to subvert manners and morals. c) The delinquent students may not resign from school, since under the law they are of an age when attendance at school is compulsory.

That is the situation which, in Brooklyn, New York, a Grand Jury prodded by Judge Samuel Leibowitz, is probing. The revelations—which include terrorism, rape, suicide, have scandalized the entire nation.

In large part, the crisis is one caused by ideology. The doctrine that all children are more or less equally educable is an egalitarian abstraction, directly responsible for laws requiring all children, regardless of aptitude or disposition to learn, to attend public schools until they reach a given age.

An extension of egalitarian sentiment discourages separation of students with reference to attainment or behavior. The clutch of this same egalitarianism dictates the mixing of Puerto Ricans, Negroes, and native Whites.

And, finally, the permissiveness one has come to associate with Progressive Education has deprived the teacher of the authority she needs to maintain order.

The result is what one would expect—chaos.

We make the following concrete suggestions to members of the school board and relevant authorities.

In every large neighborhood a special school should be established to be administered by a carefully selected staff, with special disciplinary powers. By vote of any two teachers, an unruly student would be reassigned to that central school. There an attempt should be made to distinguish between students whose problem is approachable by medical or disciplinary means and those who, for one reason or another, are uneducable. The second category would be dismissed, and would be ineligible for further participation in the public program. The second category would be corrected and sent back, in due course, to the regular schools. Repeated transgressions would, presumably, graduate a student to the category of the incorrigibles, and lead to expulsion.

In the meantime, the staffs of every school should be encouraged to effect any reorganization of classes that conduces to order. If it appears wise, let us say, to segregate newly arrived Puerto Ricans until individual behavior has been observed, or slow learners until their faculties have sharpened, that should be done.

Here, then, are a set of suggestions. Tentative proposals by the New York school board, made public last week, appear to be in the right direction. If, out of a tender solicitude for the sensibilities of Liberal ideology, adequate reforms are not adopted, then the very least that the New York Legislature should do is permit parents to withdraw their children from the Jacobins' crucible.

U.S.
$
Mr Bottle: "Dear ol' Red Eye. (Hic) Fren' in fact. Yuh gave me frens ev'ry where, cur'd my cr-op (Burp) surp-lushes. an' now ol' pal you'll save me from Spush-nik."
Ed Rathbun

How Comic an Opera?

It is tempting to laugh off the sloppily staged "union" of Egypt and Syria as a political burlesque, and so it may prove to be. In Cairo, Presidents Nasser and Al-Kuwatly managed to get cardboard triumphal arches and a fireworks display ready in time for the curtain, but nothing else had been rehearsed. Indeed, the script itself is not yet written: even the barest terms of the merger of these two geographically, ethnically and historically separated nations have not been decided.

But if we contrast the Cairo performance with the simultaneous show put on by the Baghdad Pact in Ankara, critical judgment wavers. At Ankara, Secretary Dulles and the Baghdad spokesmen were reasonable, sober, pedestrian. Nothing unexpected, nothing creative came out of their gathering. But the idea of the Egypt-Syria union springs, on the one hand, from Nasser's bold, wild, irrational vision of a great new Arab empire commanding the crossroads of the earth and sweeping on toward the heartlands of Africa and Asia; and, on the other, from the cold maneuvers of the Soviet strategists who believe—perhaps overconfidently—that they can use Nasser in accomplishing the ruin of the West. Even yesterday it would have seemed incredible that an independent state would voluntarily decide overnight, as Syria seems

to have done, to renounce its sovereignty and become a mere district of another nation, and a rather small and shabby nation at that.

In our century the bold, the wild and the irrational have proved often enough before this that they can sweep aside all that is reasoned, sober and pedestrian, and prevail even unto the last limit of the absurd. Maybe it is all a puppet show that will collapse once the strings are loosened. But let us not be too easily complacent, or rest content at seeing in Nasser only the mountebank that the Western world first saw in Lenin, Mussolini and Hitler. While we have forborne, Nasser has dared to act. In the explosive soil of the Middle East, that act of political will now smoulders like an almost lighted fuse.

Our Ingenious Farmers

When the Soil Bank program was proclaimed a year and a half ago, farmers rushed to put their poorer acres in the "bank." Far from helping to reduce the crop surplus, however, the Soil Bank idea has backfired. Much of the money which farmers have received for idling their more sterile strips has been spent on fertilizers for the remaining acres. The result is what might have been foreseen: the surpluses are practically as big as ever.

To repair the leak in the original program, the Administration is now offering to pay farmers for idling whole farms, the relatively good acres along with the bad. In Illinois, Nebraska and Tennessee some twenty thousand farmers have signed up to quit commercial farming entirely. This is in line with the Committee for Economic Development's program for solving the problem of the surplus. Unfortunately, the Administration has distorted the CED idea. Instead of insisting that the idle farmers use the new Soil Bank payments to prepare themselves for other ways of life, the Administration is merely subsidizing farm owners to take five-year vacations. Moreover, it has not coupled the idling of marginal land with a return to the free market in cotton, corn, wheat, etc.

What will happen is easy to predict: the remaining farmers will find ways of growing still larger amounts of wheat, peanuts, etc. At support price levels.

Henry Reuther II

The indomitable Mr. Frank Chodorov sends us a proposal which he is making to Mr. Walter Reuther, which we pass along: "By committing the union's savings, its pension fund, and levying the same assessment he is now levying in anticipation of a strike, Mr. Reuther should be able to gather together enough funds to enable him to buy out one of the automobile companies, or at least enough of its stock to give him control. He and the UAW would then be in the automobile business, management end, and he could easily institute his famous profit-sharing scheme.

"We assume, of course, that he knows how to run an automobile business; he has been talking so much about the inefficiency of management that that assumption ought to be safe. But, heaven forbid, suppose it turns out that the public does not buy the automobiles he produces? He would find that the methods he has used so effectively in coping with union dissidents will not work on pestiferous consumers. If the consumer refused to buy his automobiles, he would find himself in the unenviable position of having to substitute, for his profit-sharing plan, a loss-sharing plan. His union members might not like that.

"But I have thought of that horrible contingency and have worked out a protective insurance policy. Reuther claims to be able to deliver to any politician who works with him a sizable vote. That being so, he could easily induce the politicians he controls to place with his company cost-plus orders to insure his having a profit, even if his automobiles do not sell in the competitive market.

"What's wrong with this plan? Why have not the automobile magnates suggested it to Mr. Reuther?"

Why not?

Monitor Over Hoffa

The thirteen members of the Teamsters Union who mutinied against President-Elect James R. Hoffa on the ground that he had been fraudulently elected by a rigged convention, and who took their case before a federal court, have won a substantial, if not quite unconditional, victory. Though under the settlement approved by Judge Letts, Hoffa takes over from Dave Beck as President, he does so not as the blustering bullyboy to whom all is permitted, but as a merely provisional officer under the control of a three-man Board of Monitors which as agent of the court will enforce a set of carefully drawn rules for democracy and honesty in the administration of the union's affairs. If Hoffa steps off the reservation, the Monitors are empowered to suspend him, and to supervise a new election; they will in any case guarantee the democratic and constitutional conduct of the Teamsters' next regular election.

By submitting himself to this humiliating formula, Hoffa is implicitly admitting the charges against him. True, it grates in the throat that by the settlement Hoffa continues in high place, as a leader of an association of more than a million American citizens; and we are never enthusiastic about the extension of a court's activities into lengthy administrative func-

(*Continued on p. 152*)

Welcome, Explorer; Thanks, Mr. Baldwin

NATIONAL REVIEW salutes Explorer. If it is no bigger than it is, it is—unlike Sputnik—at least as big as its masters say it is. If it was a little late arriving over San Diego, that was because it performed better—rose higher—than it was supposed to. If it started its rounds a few weeks later than Sputnik, it has a better parentage: it is not by Inferiority Complex out of Desire for a Propaganda Stunt, and has not been fed at the expense of more promising youngsters growing up in its neighborhood. If the rocket that fired it hadn't much thrust, it strongly reassures those of us who have believed all along that, when and as we need it militarily, we shall have the world's most powerful rocket. If it constitutes a mere slight "propaganda recovery," rather than a great "propaganda victory," it may remind some of us that propaganda victories have their dangers; for, having established propagandistically the axiom that technological superiority equals superiority, the Russians are, and will continue to be, stuck with that axiom through the inevitable future period when we shall forge 'way ahead.

And, best of all, Explorer has initiated the return to sanity that had to come before the nation could read and digest Mr. Hanson Baldwin's admirable analysis in the *New York Times*, excerpted on this page, of the nation's present military position.

Mr. Baldwin says, calmly and dispassionately: We are ahead; we shall stay ahead if we conduct ourselves with courage and intelligence. And he adds, in effect: It won't be easy to stay ahead, and it won't be cheap. Those are the things that have needed saying, in a voice of authority and in an intellectual climate in which they might be heeded. Mr. Baldwin provides the voice, and Explorer—at long last—the climate.

The Implications

"Any program for survival . . . involves sacrifice, hard work, huge costs, difficult judgments and imaginative research."

"Our objectives contemplate very few ICBM missiles in the 1960 fiscal year; more should be ordered now . . . The Navy's ship-based Polaris IRBM . . . for submerged submarine launching . . . should have very high priorities. . . . [An] intercontinental ballistic missile project should be initiated with a solid-propellent motor . . . Missile-warning radar with a range of 3,000 nautical miles has been proved technically feasible . . . Construction of these warning stations [must] be started during this Arctic summer . . . An entire anti-missile missile system . . . should have the highest priority."

"Two missile-firing submarines in service and six new ones . . . are an unimaginative—and far too modest—beginning. . . ."

"A speed-up in . . . equipment for Anti-Submarine Warfare and high priority for research and development in this field is essential."

We need "air-to-surface missiles, decoys, electronic protection and other devices that would extend materially [the] useful military life [of our piloted bombers]."

"There is no need in the future to build tremendous heavy bombers . . . The Convair B-58 is a trend in the right direction . . . more should be ordered."

"More research and development of specialized aircraft for non-nuclear missions is essential."

The Estimates

". . . not only the United States and the Soviet Union, but all mankind, walk in danger."

". . . The Soviet Union is unlikely to attempt a nuclear Pearl Harbor . . . unless she is almost certain she will not receive unacceptable loss and damage in retaliation."

"A Soviet 1,000 mile missile is probably available—or soon will be . . . But some Spanish, and all North African bases . . . would be beyond its reach."

". . . a long-range missile will be for some time to come an inaccurate and unreliable weapon . . . Ballistic missiles—as yet, and for some time to come—are far behind the plane in the capability of carrying a high-powered nuclear punch."

"Our overseas bases virtually surround the Eurasian land mass and they are far closer to vital centers in the Soviet Union than Soviet bases are to the United States."

"The danger of a surprise attack achieving a knock-out capability increases . . . as accurate long-range ballistic missiles are produced . . . The defense will be confronted with a terrible question . . . Are those blips on the radar screen . . . the real thing? . . . There will be little time to decide, and the consequences of mistake a disaster."

"The Soviet's slight advantage in the development of long-range missiles does decrease her risks and increase ours. . . . [But a] strategy of despair is technically unnecessary. . . ."

tions. But granted the circumstances, the thirteen and their very able attorneys, Professor Godfrey P. Schmidt and ex-Congressman Thomas Dodd, showed both courage and good sense, first in initiating an action against a vindictive union oligarchy, and then in bringing it to a conclusion more favorable than any precedent gave them a right to expect, and much more useful to the cause of union reform than the formal, and empty, total legal triumph they might have won after years of litigation.

Our Contributors: GEORGE F. CARTER ("The Americas: A Fable in Reverse") served during World War II as a research analyst for the Office of Strategic Services. Professor Carter is presently Chairman of the Department of Geography at Johns Hopkins.

NATIONAL TRENDS

L. BRENT BOZELL

Big Labor and the Mundt Bills

Senator Mundt has tossed into the hopper five bills designed to curb trade union abuses. The bills, he says, add up to "a new Bill of Rights for American Labor." Whether their reach is quite that grand will bear some talking about a little later on. But they do go much further than the Administration's proposals submitted by Secretary Mitchell. And since they promise to get some attention by Congress (the Senator is expected to testify soon before the labor committees of the Senate and House), the bills are worth examining.

Bill I seeks to prevent union officials from doing wrong things with union monies. One section of the bill, which Dave Beck obviously had a hand in inspiring, makes it a federal criminal offense for union officials to make off with funds belonging to the union or to "a welfare or benefit plan" controlled by the union. But the real teeth of the bill are in its disclosure requirements: in the provision that the union must submit its financial records to examination by the Comptroller of the Currency as the price of exercising its collective bargaining rights under the NLRB and of claiming its normal tax exemption. Unless the Comptroller certifies he has examined the union's books, the union is not entitled to press its claims with the National Labor Relations Board in representation disputes or in cases of alleged unfair labor practices. Neither does it get its federal income-tax exemption.

Moreover, Mundt would give the Comptroller sweeping authority to determine whether union or welfare plan funds are being handled "in an unsafe or unwise manner" and whether they are "being devoted to the purposes for which they are collected"—and, unless an offending union "promptly" reforms, to publish his findings. Thus, where the misuse of funds is not of the embezzlement variety, the bill's sanction—and it could be an effective one—is adverse publicity; but even that, be it noted, would depend entirely on an alert and conscientious Comptroller.

Bill II, perhaps the most far-reaching of the batch, seeks to insure democratic control of union affairs. With regard to election of officers, a union must provide for the nomination of "opposing candidates" by means of "a party or other system which will afford members . . . an opportunity to participate in the selection of candidates"; it must use a secret ballot; and it must let a representative of the NLRB count the votes. In other matters "directly affecting the economic well-being" of union members—*e.g.*, calling strikes, fixing dues, levying special assessments—decisions must be made by majority rule with a secret ballot. The bill's sanctions, again, are loss of collective bargaining rights and of income-tax exemption. A union is entitled to neither unless it proves "to the satisfaction" of the NLRB that its by-laws reflect the requirements of the bill, and that the by-laws have been observed.

Note, however, an obvious shortcoming of Bill II: its failure to move in on the practice, so glaringly in evidence last summer during the reelection of the Steelworkers' David McDonald, of incumbent officers marshaling the union's financial and personnel resources on behalf of their own campaigns.

Bill III makes a stab at removing criminal elements from positions of power in the unions. Before a union can exercise its collective bargaining rights or get its tax exemption, its officers (and the officers of any national or international affiliate) must file affidavits with the NLRB, stating they are not ineligible to vote under their state laws by reason of a criminal conviction. Of course, the bill can affect only the worst offenders, and even then its effectiveness will vary from state to state; it may do little more than cause some convicts to move. Then, too, as Jimmy Hoffa knows, a conviction is not the sole badge of anti-social conduct.

Bill IV will, predictably, provoke the loudest howl from Big Labor. Mundt would make it an unfair labor practice for a union to picket an employer for organization or representation purposes—unless one third of the employees that the union is trying to organize give their prior approval to the picketing, in writing. Moreover, the offending union would lose its tax exemption while the NLRB's finding of such an unfair labor practice is in effect. Mundt chose the one-third figure on the thought that a smaller percentile would require too few signatures in small plants, and, conversely, that a larger one would make signature-gathering overly burdensome at, say,

Boeing. (The figure, of course, had to be less than 50 per cent; a majority of any bargaining unit can petition the NLRB for recognition, and thus has no cause to picket.)

Bill V deals with one of the more serious union abuses, the use of union funds in political campaigns. Senator Mundt would deny income-tax exemption to an offending union. But his definition of the offense—to "participate in, or intervene in [including the publishing or distributing of statements] any political campaign on behalf of any candidate"—raises doubts about the bill's usefulness: it is even less exacting than the language of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, which Walter Reuther, *et al*, have had little difficulty in circumventing. On the other hand, obliging juries are what have saved Reuther under the FCPA (*cf.* this column, Dec. 7, 1957); Mundt's idea of enforcing the law through an administrative tribunal might be more successful—provided the Bureau of Internal Revenue can withstand the political pressure.

The Contesting Position

So much for Mundt's proposals. They are not a cure-all of labor abuses; far from it. Nor, clearly, do they justify Senator Mundt's more modest claim—that they amount to a "Bill of Rights" for the American worker. No legislation is going to qualify for that title that leaves intact Big Labor's power to compel union membership as the price of a job. Still, if what you're after is stricter federal regulation of unions in areas of flagrant abuse of power, Mundt's bills are highly relevant and would be, in most respects, useful. And if that's what *they're* after, Mundt's colleagues should be grateful for his lead, and follow it.

I cannot, however, down the fear that Mundt's approach, notably in Bills I and II, abets the long-term aims of Walter Reuther and others who would have Big Labor wield decisive political power in the United States. It seems to me that these measures, while tightening the reins of labor leaders in local situations, make concessions to the *total position* of organized labor—concessions that tend to cut away the ground on which defenders of the free enterprise system must, in the last analysis, take their stand.

In order to appreciate this total position of Big Labor and its champions, it might be well, first, to state the contesting position. Under free enterprise premises, the function of the trade union is to represent those laborers who want collective representation in employee-employer bargaining. Because the employer's economic power is often such as to discourage individual laborers from getting together, the State has enacted laws to protect collective bargaining where it is desired. But those laws, according to the free enterprise position, go beyond their rationale when they require collective bargaining of persons who do *not* desire it: labor then ceases to be a free commodity and laborers cease to be free men. It follows that trade unions must have the status of voluntary associations; to maintain that status, they must be restricted to their natural function (bargaining), and the State must not accord them rights *or impose burdens on them* that make them something else.

Challenging this position, there is a different and, one must concede, the ascendant view of the trade union movement. Now the working man is not merely a citizen who is, incidentally, a member or a non-member of a trade union. And the individual trade union is not one among many bargaining associations. The working population, as a whole, is a *class*. And the trade union movement represents the class. And this class stands over against the rest of society as a kind of state within a state. It has rights and duties and goals that transcend those of its individual members and that are subject only to the rules set down by the larger institution, the nation, of which it is a part. Thus, when the issue is compulsory union membership, the relevant question is not, What are the desires of the individual citizen?—but What are the desires of the class? And the question is answered in the way comparable questions are answered in a democratic society: by resort to majority rule. And as with comparable situations in a democratic society, the minority is expected to conform—in this case by joining the union, and (since freeloading is recognizably unjust) by helping to pay the union's bills.

Similarly, with the question of using compulsory union dues for political purposes: a law forbidding the practice, the free enterpriser says, upholds the individual worker's right under the First Amendment to promote political ideas of his own choosing. Not so, says Mr. Justice Douglas. The relevant "right" is that of a "segment of society" (*i.e.*, the working population) to express its views on any matters that concern it, and for these purposes, "the rule of the majority" pertains. Thus, the Constitution, an instrument of the whole society, is invoked—not to protect individual citizens, but a self-constituted group of the society.

Special Relationship Implied

Now, I fear that the State cannot make laws that deal with a group of citizens, *qua* the group, without implicitly acknowledging the claims the group makes for itself. And this even though the laws, on their face, restrict the group's activities. Senator Mundt would forbid unions to make expenditures that are "unwise" or "unsafe" in the State's view. What other "voluntary association" is so restricted, and, consequently, so burdened with the obligations of a public trust? Senator Mundt would have the State establish rules for governing the conduct of union affairs? What other "voluntary association" must observe democracy, as defined by the State, within its own counsels? To repeat the point: when it assumes responsibility for the trade union's internal affairs, the State implies a special relationship between it and the union—a relationship that tends to confirm the union's claim concerning *all* members of the working population.

Would it not be better, under the circumstances, to strike at abuses of power on the part of labor leaders through measures designed to reduce the bases of unwarranted power? If compulsory unionism and its wide bargaining, the two mainstays of labor leaders' power, were outlawed, they might have to compete for the adherence of the working population on terms that would discourage high-handedness and dishonesty in the management of union affairs..

Letter From London

ANTHONY LEJEUNE

The Government's Retreat from Sound Money

Economics is rightly regarded as a dismal subject of study, but for us in Britain it has become all too vividly a part of the real world. Headlines are currently being made by three different topics, each an aspect of our economic plight.

The dust and debris of the Chancellor's resignation are beginning to settle. Mr. Thorneycroft and the two junior Ministers who resigned with him made statements in their constituencies: the new Chancellor, Mr. Heathcoat Amory, expressed sad puzzlement over the resignations and pledged himself to continue the fight against inflation: and the affair culminated in a Parliamentary debate on a Government motion carefully framed so that every shade of Conservative, including Mr. Thorneycroft himself, could vote for it—"That this House supports the Government in their resolve to maintain by every effective means the internal and external value of the pound sterling."

Whatever the Government may say, nobody believes that the cause of the resignations was a trivial disagreement about a nominal sum. We now know, for instance, that the 50 million pounds which Mr. Macmillan shrugged off so lightly is not the total expected increase of this year's Budget over last year's but the increase over what was actually spent last year, including huge supplementary estimates which have not yet been presented. The real increase can hardly be less than 150 million pounds and may well be as high as 250 million. This was not an accountants' quarrel; it was one of philosophies or at least of personal attitudes. Mr. Thorneycroft had come to believe, and none too soon, that sound money was now far and away the most important objective of Government policy. He had already made a number of compromises and wasn't prepared to slither any further.

The unions are the crux of the matter. Mr. Thorneycroft stressed in his Parliamentary speech that no amount of fiscal juggling could save us. Either we stop the annual grant of wage increases unmatched by any comparable increase in the production of real wealth, or we do not stop inflation.

The Union Offensive

Wage claims have been steadily building up again during the past few weeks. Railway workers and electricity supply workers, builders, busmen and dockers are all demanding more money for the same or less work. Coal miners are claiming an immediate increase. The railwaymen and the busmen have both been going through those ritual motions of claim, refusal and further claim which lead to arbitration and then to compromise or a strike. Coal and transport: if their costs go up again, almost every other price must follow.

The more responsible trade union leaders have sobered down a bit lately but there is no reason to suppose that any of them is yet willing, or could persuade his followers, voluntarily to abandon a wage claim. The dockers hardly improved their case the other day when a ship arrived at the London docks. Two gangs of dockers argued for three hours about which of them should unload the cargo. The result was that fifty tons were still in the hold at knocking-off time: and at knocking-off time, of course, everyone immediately knocked off. Next morning, to their chagrin, the dockers found that the ship had left. They promptly demanded pay for the fifty tons of unloading which they hadn't done, under the quaint name of "disappointment money." When they didn't get it, they struck. In due course, the money was forthcoming.

There will be no end to our economic troubles until somebody has the courage to deal with the unions; but where that somebody is to be found I can't imagine. Certainly not in the present Labor Party.

Socialist irresponsibility was firmly pinned by the third item of financial news: the Report of the Tribunal set up to investigate allegations of a leak before last autumn's rise in the Bank Rate. These allegations were made and persisted in by the Labor leaders: when the general accusations became so specific as to have been libelous had they not been protected by Parliamentary privilege, the Prime Minister was forced to order a full investigation.

The members of the Tribunal were sufficiently distinguished to be above criticism. The investigation was long and searching. The cost in time, money and talent must have been enormous: certainly it made a wonderfully lavish drama for the general public. Now the Report has been published. It says categorically that there was no leak. The Socialists were repeating the emptiest tittle-tattle.

So what do they do now? Do they say they're sorry? Do they even say, as would be sensible and honorable: "We wanted to know if there was a leak and we're glad to learn there wasn't"? They do not. They forget all about the accusations they made; instead they shake their heads sternly over a peripheral point about who should be directors of the Bank of England and demand a two-day bebate on the whole matter. The left-wing newspapers cry that the City has been whitewashed, and the Labor Party congratulates itself on having forced an investigation into this corrupt haunt of capitalism.

In fact, the financiers of the City of London came out of the affair extraordinarily well. As the Tribunal said, their reputation for integrity may even have been enhanced. We must hope so, for an attack on the City is an attack on sterling, and therefore another undermining of our defenses against inflation. Few politicians on either side nowadays really seem to believe in a free capitalist system, which is one reason why the system is not working well and the pound is an constant danger. But for sheer irresponsibility sparked by political hatred, the Labor Party is streets ahead: and that remains the one unanswerable argument why Conservatives must support the Government however badly the Government behaves.

The Americas: A Fable in Reverse

To disprove the argument that the U.S. owes its prosperity to natural resources, the author asks: how would the land look today if people of another political and economic cast had settled it?

GEORGE F. CARTER

When the depression hit this nation in the 1930s we were told that we had to change our ways. Our governmental forms had been wasteful and destructive. It was only our resources, the gifts of Nature, that had made us great. Indeed, so bountiful had these gifts been that they had made us great in spite of ourselves. But now that was ended. The frontier was gone, our soils were eroding, our forests depleted, our resources becoming exhausted. We would have to abandon our old ways of *laissez-faire* and turn to a planned society.

I don't think the premises for this argument are sound. I don't think it was our location, area, or resources that made us great; I think it was our political and economic outlook. And to try to give point to my assertion, I will proceed to a hypothetical historical reconstruction. I will have the Portuguese discover and settle what is now the United States and do here what they did in Brazil, and the British discover and settle what is now Brazil and do there what they did in their North American colonies.

But first a few comments on the vast and bountiful resources of America. Colonial beginnings were made in areas of poor resources. New England soils are poor, thin and stony. The climate is severe. Farming in the area has to a large extent been abandoned since better lands have become available. Nor is New England rich in iron, coal, or oil.

The Virginia colony did not start in any forcing bed of good soils. Neither did the colonists find good iron ore, or coal, or oil, or much of anything except some none too favorable land. The whole Eastern seaboard is no Cercadia, yet the greatness that was to be America was forged here during the time that a foothold was being hacked out of the wilderness.

But let's get on with our mythical history. We will begin by having the Portuguese discover what is now the United States, as follows:

A Portuguese U.S.

Joa de Silva first sighted a low-lying land which came later to be called Florida. Investigation showed it to be a peninsula and generally swampy and tropical. In his reports to the King he stressed the possibility of growing sugar cane there. This was of considerable interest to the Portuguese Crown because for some time the Portuguese had been producing sugar with Negro labor on islands off the coast of Africa. The profits were enormous.

De Silva explored northward and reported a broad coastal plain that narrowed to the north. Toward its upper end were three great bays where immense rivers came to the sea. These were the Chesapeake and Delaware Bays, and Long Island Sound. He reached this region in the fall of the year and noted that it was one of strong climatic change. Before turning back he rounded Cape Cod and explored the shore to the north. This he reported to be bleak, rocky, and backed by great coniferous forests; a land of little promise compared to the warmer Southern coast, which offered prospects of crops and products not to be found in the mother country.

Sailing south, he rounded Florida, explored the Gulf Coast and discovered the Mississippi. This tropical coast, with its mild winter, promised well for the development of such crops as tobacco, cotton, and in places even sugar cane. The Mississippi he immediately recognized as a great waterway of immense value for developing the interior, as well as trade with the natives. Because of the proximity of its mouth to the latitudes most easily reached by sailing ships departing Portugal on the trade winds, he recommended that it be made the site of the colonial capital. His second choice was a location in the vicinity of modern Charleston, also to be reached easily by ships taking the trades across the tropical Atlantic, and with the added advantage that ships could take the westerly winds back across the north Atlantic to Portugal.

And so it was done. Cities were established at the mouth of the Mississippi and on the southeast coast. Tropical crops that could be fed into the economy of the home country and readily sold in European markets were encouraged. This meant rice and indigo along the coastal plains of the south, and some sugar cane in Florida. To the north along the coastal plain, tobacco was planted. As the settlements expanded, cotton growing was tried.

Slave Labor

The system of production adopted was the Portuguese one of grants of great blocks of land to a few families, who worked them with masses of slaves directed by a few Portuguese. The demand for labor was insatiable. To supply it, armies were maintained which systematically raided into the interior, seized whole villages of Indians and drove them off to supply the great coastal plantations.

The Indians were a poor source of labor, however. They died like flies from the diseases the Portuguese had brought with them. They were un-

accustomed to slavery. Their spirits broke, and they wasted away. It became necessary to go farther to find populations to enslave.

The resourceful Portuguese had long been using Negro slaves off the coast of Africa, and they now turned to importing them. They were more effective as a labor force. Not that they liked slavery any better than the Indians, but at least they were accustomed to the diseases of the Old World.

The coastal regions became fairly developed by great plantations. But there was no expansion inland. The crops produced were of high value and required intensive cultivation. The great families won a rich living from a few plantations. Why should they do more? It was effort enough to find good overseers in Portugal, and soldiers to guard the slaves. As for letting the Portuguese people take up small holdings and develop the interior—unthinkable!

Interior Land Undeveloped

So the coast flourished, and the interior was depopulated. The Iberian curse of latifundia was on the land. It would be centuries before it was overcome. The colony would break its ties with the homeland but the cultural imprint of the system would remain. The interior would remain empty. Even in the twentieth century only 2 per cent of the land would be cultivated, and nearly 90 per cent of the people would live on the coastal strip from New York around to New Orleans. Most of them would be jammed into a few great cities, of which the greatest would be the ancient colonial capitals of Charleston, Savannah and New Orleans.

True, it would be known that there were great reserves of iron in the deep interior, and possibly great oil reserves. But little would be done to develop them. Only belatedly, in the mid-century would the coal, iron and limestone found right around Birmingham be developed.

The (Portuguese) United States would be a second-rate power, with an undeveloped interior, with its population jammed into cities, with its wealth poorly distributed, its population unhealthy. The socio-economic structure of its government would stifle initiative and risk capital and hence, development.

A British Brazil

This is an imaginative picture, transferring to North America in thumbnail sketch what happened in Brazil. Now let's see what we can do with Brazil in the hands of the British —another mythical history.

The British had been enviously eyeing the Spanish and Portuguese colonies and begun nibbling on the galleons loaded with treasure being transported home from the New World. In pursuing the galleons they were led into the Caribbean. They might have liked to settle on the coast of North America, but the Portuguese were too strongly entrenched there. Besides, colonies in the tropical regions would furnish products complementing the home economy.

Quite naturally, then, their attention came to rest on the coast of Brazil, an area of secondary interest to both the Spanish and the Portuguese. The Spanish were concentrating their attention on the incredible wealth in gold and silver to be found in the civilizations of the Aztecs and the Incas. The Portuguese were busy with their developments to the north.

The initial British settlements were made by gentlemen adventurers who hoped for gold or other easy wealth. Without the hard-headed good sense of Captain John Smith, the original settlement at Bahia would have failed miserably. As it was, the beginnings were difficult enough. A second colony was started by a group of religious separatists at Rio de Janeiro. This group, too, at first clung precariously to the edge of the continent.

Both colonies, however, made it possible for individuals to hold land. The Rio settlers even had advanced notions of self-government. Other colonies were founded. A group of Catholics under Lord Baltimore got started at Recife and introduced the concept of religious liberty. From these footholds, the people began spreading inland, taking up individual holdings and clearing the land. They developed a spirit of independence and freedom that everyone coming over from the mother colony commented upon.

At first the colonists were hard-pressed to determine what to do with this new country. They raised some grain, adopting the plants of the country. Soon, however, they discovered tobacco and found that it had a profitable market in Europe. They had good timber to sell. They found that they could produce rice, indigo, cotton, and even sugar cane, and soon had a thriving trade established. They had also begun to trade with the natives and had a growing business in hides and furs. Monkey fur and bright bird feathers were in great demand, especially in the French fashion market, and could be obtained from the natives for a few handfuls of beads. With a keg of rum it was possible to get a whole village drunk and trade them out of everything they owned. The colonies flourished!

Power for Industry

When the mother country began to enter the so-called industrial revolution, news of the magical new machines that could spin and weave was carried to the colonies. Soon they learned that these machines could be harnessed to water power and made to do the work of thousands of hands. The independent and bumptious colonists looked about them. Back of the narrow coastal fringe rose the edge of the Brazilian plateau. It was bathed throughout the year in heavy rains. There was no frozen period and no dry period. The small streams descending the escarpment toward the sea had a steep fall and a dependable flow. The colonies were already producing cotton. They had the power, and plenty of it, and in streams of a size that could be managed. It wasn't long before they had arranged for the smuggling out of the plans for these new machines. They had added to their agriculture the basis for industry.

The population kept expanding inland. Restless elements traveled through the Indian territory. Itchy-footed settlers followed, hacking out

Call of the Jungfrau

It isn't hopes,
They aren't dopes;
It's the pull *magnetique*
Of a Swiss mountain peak.

JOHANNES EFF

homesteads. Soon the population was flooding through the passes and into the interior. One great highway was the Rio Sao Francisco. For a time goods and materials came back to the coast. But presently the settlers found the great interior rivers leading to the Amazon, and despite the rapids that had to be portaged, they established water routes to a great city that soon grew up at its mouth. As steamships came along they applied them to their rivers. At first they tried building canals around the rapids. But soon the railroad era was upon them, and rail lines were driven inland cutting east and west across the head waters of the river system that ran north to the Amazon. It was a magnificent combination: One of the world's greatest rivers gave the largest ships unlimited access, on an east-west axis, to the northern part of the country. Other great rivers ran from north and south into this river. Cheap water transportation! The east-west railroads through the south tapped the heads of these streams.

The settlers found some coal and abundant water power. There were whole mountains of iron. They found that they had virtually a world monopoly of industrial diamonds. When the world awoke to rubber they discovered vast amounts of it. When the era of petroleum dawned, they found an immense and promising sedimentary zone along the foot of the Andes. The first wells put down in the Blue Goose district brought in high grade oil, and further great fields were rapidly developed.

The people had early thrown off the colonial yoke. Under a governmental system providing maximum individual liberty, where risk-taking was rewarded and land was free for the taking, the more energetic seized their opportunities and made fortunes. Wealth and learning accumulated and the country became a great power.

Advantages of the South

In assessing their strength and trying to evaluate their achievement, the people often looked at the only like-sized nation in the New World —the United States. It was occupied by Portuguese-speaking people. They had not been able to do much with their large inheritance of land. To be sure, it had many drawbacks. Fully a third of it was distressingly dry and considerably more was subject to great risk of drought. Only a small corner of Brazil has that disadvantage.

It was true that the soils in the Amazon Basin had proved disappointing, but the region had become valuable for its production of such tropical tree crops as rubber, quinine, tea, citrus fruits, a great variety of nuts, and other exotic products that found a steady market abroad. With their leadership in education and science, the British in Brazil bred up the best strains of all these trees. No other region in the world could compete with their climate, location, know-how, capital and intelligent labor.

Brazil had no frozen wastes, no areas that were out of production for a fourth to a third of the year because of the severity of the winters. Its streams did not dry or freeze up and cripple hydroelectric output. It was blessed with an even climate, a vast expanse of good soil, incomparable waterways, mountains of iron ore, vast reservoirs of petroleum. No wonder it had become a great power! Oh well, maybe those people up in the United States would some day put people on the land, and set up an incentive system under which any bright and energetic man could go into business with the expectation of making a reasonable profit. Then they would see. And when they had peopled the empty interior they could afford to have railroads running through it. Who knows, they might even find that they, too, had vast oil deposits, mountains of iron ore, and other resources that would enable them also to become a world power.

The moral of this tale, I repeat, is that it was not our resources that made us great; it was our political and economic system. We could have done the same thing in Brazil, or in any number of other places. And should you think that no one has ever before pointed out the riches of Brazil, I will close with a paraphrase of P. E. James, a life-long student of that country: The Brazilians had such superlative exploitation that they moved from one boom to another. Their aim was "to collect the fruit without planting the tree."

CLASSIFIED

NATIONAL REVIEW *accepts classified advertisements for personal services, items wanted or for sale, jobs sought or available, houses or apartments for sale or rent, and miscellaneous subjects of a comparable nature.* NATIONAL REVIEW *reserves the right to reject any copy deemed unsuitable. Rates per insertion: 40¢ per word, minimum 10 words; 30¢ per word for 25 or more insertions per year. If a box number is desired, count two extra words. Text, accompanied by full payment in the form of cash, check or money order, must be received 17 days before publication date. All responses to box numbers will be forwarded and postage billed periodically. Mail to be called for at* NATIONAL REVIEW *will be held 60 days only. Address: Classified Dept.,* NATIONAL REVIEW, *211 East 37th Street, New York 16, N.Y.*

HANDWRITING ANALYSIS by mail $2. Available for parties and lectures. Dorothy Sara, 11 E. 32 St., NYC.

TAX-DEDUCTIBLE donations are urgently needed by 135-year-old Junior College in Southern state. Complete information available. Box 13.

ART DIRECTOR, creative, heavy direct mail and advertising experience, seeks free-lance designing or art work. Box 77.

FREEDOM SCHOOL now accepting applications for enrollment in 1958 summer courses. Some scholarships are available on a merit basis. Instructors include: Frank Chodorov, James Doenges, E. W. Dykes, Percy Greaves Jr., F. A. Harper, R. C Hoiles, Louis Milione Jr., Robert LeFevre, Leonard Read, James Rogers, Fred Clark, Rose Wilder Lane, William Paton. Write Box 165, Colorado Springs, Colo., for free descriptive folder.

FREEDOM THROUGH UNDERSTANDING fourteen great life-problems. *Balanced Living:* sample, 25¢. School of Living, Brookville, Ohio.

WANTED MAY 1 by responsible professional woman, only tenant: Manhattan apartment, one bedroom, separate kitchen, elevator. West Side considered; to $115. Box 1.

WANTED, apartment, midtown Manhattan, East Side, 2½ rooms unfurnished, $125 to $150. Box 47.

WOULD YOU LIKE to be on mailing list for Crusade for America Forums? Write 51 Front St., Rockville Center, L.I., N.Y.

INDIVIDUAL TRIPS to suit requirements, worldwide. Margaret Cone Travel Service, 520 5th Ave., N.Y. 36, OX 7-0796.

TAPE RECORDINGS of Jan. 23 National Review Forum mock trial "Brown vs. Board of Education," available at $10 each. Supply limited. Box 18.

FOR SALE: File of French satirical and political magazines, early 1900's. Details from Box 101.

COLLEGE STUDENTS! Promote National Review on your campus, for pleasure and profit. Help spread the word at your school. Details on request. Write Dept. C, National Review, 211 E. 37th St., New York 16, N.Y.

WHO SHOULD HEAR about NATIONAL REVIEW? National Review will pay competitive rates for mailing lists of conservatives. Strictest confidence observed. Box 56.

Letter from Siam

E. v. KUEHNELT-LEDDIHN

Outpost of the Free World

I hesitated for a moment to use the word Siamese because all of a sudden there is an insistence in this old independent monarchy, which I have just left, on clinging to the words Thai, Thailand and Thailandic instead of Siam and Siamese. The word Thai is by no means an innovation, but an historic expression. Only its official use in Western languages is new.

Asiatic countries periodically go through curious phases of desiring to change their names not in local usage, but in foreign languages. Thus the Annamites want to be known as Vietnamese, the Malays of the Archipelago as Indonesians (even in their own idiom, though the word is purely European), the Persians wish to be called Iranians, the Goanese, Goans, and certain Asiatics prefer the term Asians. (Perhaps it is only a matter of time before Chicago's Gold Coast will be renamed Ghana.)

This does not mean that Siam, the classic "Land of Smiles," carries a chip on its shoulder; that is precisely *not* the case. Siam has seen Japanese occupation and British liberation in World War II, but it has not known colonial status in any form—so Europeans and Americans can be perfectly at ease with the Thais. This is an ideal country for a "paleface" to live, work, or travel in. The foreigners whose means are limited and who take advantage of the simpler forms of locomotion like the trolley car, the train or the bus, will be enmeshed in numerous conversations (often in remarkably good English). The Thais may not be as keen on hard work, and they certainly are not as ambitious, as the Japanese, but they are at least as intelligent and eager to learn from the outside world.

Bangkok, perhaps the most beautiful city in the Far East, is the seat of the SEATO headquarters, which is situated on a broad modern boulevard extending from the picturesque palace area to the Parliament. The Thais are proud of their participation in so important a defense task against Communism, especially those in the Army, which is fiercely anti-Red. The coup d'état engineered by Field Marshal Sarit last year was of a clearly anti-Communist character and, although the charge of pro-Communism could not honestly be leveled against the former Prime Minister, now in exile, it is a fact that he was not effective in fighting the inroads of Communism, especially in organized labor.

The coup d'éta' shows that democracy and democratic procedure, which are not native to Asia, cannot be imposed overnight, and especially not in the face of well-organized, foreign - supported demagoguery. (There is a "Siamese Government in Exile," headed by a former Prime Minister, in Red China.) Even the delightful posters, teaching the values, the intricacies and the procedures of voting, cannot change this. But there is no reason for us to sneer at the "backward Asiatics"; the Germans in 1932, in spite of their admirable literacy, showed themselves remarkably feeble defenders of human freedom.

The King's Role

Yet whatever the merits of the military Sarit-Thanom combine now in power, there is also the more than symbolic leadership of the popular young monarch (and the entire royal family). Pictures of the King and his attractive Queen can be seen in the humblest homes. The Dynasty dates back to the eighteenth century and has deep roots in the people. Only the turbulent events of the last twenty years could weaken the effective constitutional power of the monarch. The present King Phumiphon and his predecessor were educated in Switzerland, and thus monarchical rule in Siam has a strongly European coloration. There is no equivalent to Shintoism in the Siamese scene: the ruler appears as the protector of *all* religions, including the various Christian faiths. Thus the King of Thailand is not a god, but rather a *pater patriae*. Still, it will take time and patience before the King can assume his full function as head of state as the constitution envisages it. Phumiphon inherited the throne very suddenly a few years ago, following the mysterious suicide of King Ananda, which has never been entirely cleared up.

The Siamese kings were traditionally supported in their role and work by their relatives, and this tradition continues. The gifted royal family has produced statesmen, art patrons and sportsmen of renown. Among them we find Prince Wan, who serves in the Thanom Government as a Vice Premier and who is both an active member of the Thailandic-American Society and a delegate to the United Nations, which entrusted to him the Report on the Hungarian Revolution. I met this charming and brilliant man while lecturing to the Society.

Friendly to West

The free and easy contacts Americans and Europeans have with the Siamese bring into stark relief what the relations between the East and West might have been, had there been in the past a real sense of respect and responsibility by the Occident toward the Orient. In business enterprises, in the clubs, in restaurants, schools and homes the races mingle freely. Marriages between Westerners and Siamese are frequent. Everybody seems to be learning English feverishly; the number of people in buses trying to decipher American paperbacks is prodigious.

There can be no doubt that Thailand is one of the brightest spots in the over-all picture of Asia east of Singapore. I found here an absence of beggars which reminded me solely of Formosa because everywhere else in the East the outstretched hand greets the tourist from the West. Wedged in between Red China, divided Vietnam, neutralist Cambodia, troubled Burma and Communist-infested Malaya, this seems to be a solid little fortress of liberty in which the free world can put its trust.

The Supreme Court on Security

—The Record of Nineteen Months

MARIAN STEPHENSON

In the past nineteen months the Supreme Court has reviewed ten cases that bear on internal security. On all ten, the Court has found in favor of those who appealed against one or another law or administrative regulation designed to protect the nation against internal subversion.

The Decisions

1. *Communist Party* v. *Subversive Activities Control Board:*

The Court refused to uphold or pass on the constitutionality of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, thus delaying the effectiveness of the Act and hamstringing the SACB.

2. *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson:*

The Court held that it was unlawful for Pennsylvania to prosecute a Pennsylvania Communist Party leader under the Pennsylvania Sedition Act, and indicated that the anti-sedition laws of 42 states and of Alaska and Hawaii cannot be enforced.

3. *Fourteen California Communists* v. *United States*

The Court reversed two federal courts and ruled that teaching and advocating forcible overthrow of our government, even "with evil intent," was not punishable under the Smith Act as long as it was "divorced from any effort to instigate action to that end," and ordered five Communist Party leaders freed and new trials for another nine.

4. *Cole* v. *Young:*

The Court reversed two federal courts and held that, although the Summary Suspension Act of 1950 gave the federal government the right to dismiss employees "in the interest of national security of the United States," it was not in the interest of national security to dismiss an employee who contributed funds and services to a concededly subversive organization, unless that employee was in a "sensitive position."

5. *Service* v. *Dulles:*

The Court reversed two federal courts which had refused to set aside the discharge of John S. Service by the State Department. The FBI had a recording of a conversation between Service and an editor of the pro-Communist magazine *Amerasia* in the latter's hotel room, in which Service spoke of military plans which were "very secret." Earlier the FBI had found large numbers of secret and confidential State Department documents in the *Amerasia* office. The lower courts had followed the McCarran amendment, which gave the Secretary of State "absolute discretion" to discharge any employee "in the interests of the United States."

6. *Slochower* v. *Board of Higher Education of New York:*

The Court reversed the decisions of three New York courts and it has held it unconstitutional automatically to discharge a teacher, in accordance with New York law, because he took the Fifth Amendment when asked about Communist activities. In petition for rehearing, the Court admitted that its opinion was in error in stating that Dr. Harry Slochower was not aware that his claim of the Fifth Amendment would *ipso facto* result in his discharge. However, the Court denied a rehearing.

7. *Sweezy* v. *New Hampshire:*

The Court reversed the New Hampshire Supreme Court and held that the Attorney General of New Hampshire was without authority to question Prof. Paul Sweezy, a lecturer at the State University, concerning suspected subversive activities, including a certain lecture.

8. *Konigsberg* v. *State Bar of California:*

The Court reversed the decisions of the California Committee of Bar Examiners and of the California Supreme Court and held that it was unconstitutional to deny a license to practice law to an applicant who refused to answer this question put by the bar committee: 'Mr. Raphael Konigsberg, are you a Communist?" and a series of similar questions.

9. *Jencks* v. *United States:*

The Court reversed two federal courts and held that Clinton Jencks, who was convicted of filing a false non-Communist affidavit, must be given the contents of all confidential FBI reports made by any government witness in the case, even though Jencks "restricted his motions to a request for production of the reports to the trial judge for the judge's inspection and determination whether and to what extent the reports should be made available."

10. *Watkins* v. *United States:*

The Court reversed the Federal District Court and six judges of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and held that the House Committee on Un-American Activities could not require a witness, who admitted "I freely cooperated with the Communist Party," to name his Communist associates, even though the witness did not invoke the Fifth Amendment. The Court said: "We remain unenlightened as to the subject to which the questions asked petitioner were pertinent."

Other decisions have been based on the ten listed above, including at least three based on the Watkins decision.

The accompanying "Roll Call" shows how the Justices voted on the ten internal security measures.

The Roll Call

Votes on Internal Security Measures

	Against	*For*
Earl Warren	**10**	**0**
Hugo L. Black	**10**	**0**
William O. Douglas	**10**	**0**
Felix Frankfurter	**9**	**1**
John M. Harlan	**8**	**2**
Wm. J. Brennan Jr.	**5**	**0**
Harold H. Burton	**6**	**3**
Tom Clark	**2**	**7**
Chas. Evans Whittaker	**1**	**0**

Principles and Heresies

FRANK S. MEYER

A Specter Is Haunting Yale

PROFESSORS Cushing Strout and Charles L. Black Jr. are luminaries in the Yale firmament. Now, though a Princeton man myself, I am not one to maintain that no good can come out of New Haven; Bill Buckley, Brent Bozell and John Chamberlain are products of Yale, and Willmoore Kendall, if not out of it, is at least deeply in it. But, judging from two recent articles, one by Dr. Strout in *Partisan Review*, the other by Dr. Black in the *New Republic*, something is afoot at Yale.

The ideology is not particularly new, but the emotional tone that accompanies it is: a sort of combination of "The devil is dead, may the new devil soon die" with "Who's afraid of the big bad wolf?" One underlying concern seems to dominate both Dr. Strout and Dr. Black: Senator McCarthy, as the latter puts it, "was insignificant" compared to the immense danger to Liberalism from the invasion of the intellectual community by a conservative critique of Liberal fundamentals.

THE specific phenomenon which disturbs Dr. Black is Walter Berns' book, *Freedom, Virtue and the First Amendment* (which was discussed in NATIONAL REVIEW by Willmoore Kendall—Nov. 16, 23 and 30, 1957); and what particularly disturbs Dr. Black about it, is that a man whom he has to recognize as a fellow intellectual can have so little regard for the household gods of Liberalism:

> He [Berns] would, I judge, be happy and at home in just about the same kind of world as would most of the people he stigmatizes. . . . The same kind of world, that is, with one variation. Freedom, in his world, would no longer have intrinsic value. It would be guarded only insofar as it was judged efficaciously to serve other ends.
>
> This, I take it, is the philosophical bedrock of the book. When such a man assumes such a position, we rub our eyes—in astonishment, but also in the gesture of waking.

Let us be clear as to what it is that gives Dr. Black such a shock. I have my disagreement with Dr. Berns' position: I think he places freedom at too low a level of the political process; I think he gives to the state a role in the propagation of virtue that is not its function, but the function of church and family and of the intellectual leaders of society. But this is not Dr. Black's criticism. What shocks him is not Dr. Berns' position on the social *loci* of responsibility for the preservation of freedom and for the propagation of virtue. What shocks him is the blasphemy against relativism (openly uttered in the very halls of the academy) that asserts the existence of absolute value, of virtue and justice as ultimate ends.

After all, "we are so built and placed as never to be able to know for sure whether our values, or any values, have validity—or even what validity means in this sense." We are awash in a great sea of uncertainties —"Everything we know about is a process." Dr. Black "can only state some thoughts that make [him] willing to act on the belief that freedom, as a thing in itself, is worth our attachment." But he "disclaim[s] any private wire to the front office of ethical certitude, and [doesn't] think anybody else has one."

Presumably, in this whirling process that cuts off communication with "the front office of ethical certitude," Dr. Black's affection for freedom has no more moral validity than Jack the Ripper's affection for murder, or Stalin's for liquidating the kulaks, or Hitler's for gassing and disassembling Jews. It is all a matter of what passing bit of the Process any of us thinks "is worth our attachment."

THESE are the standard arguments of Liberalism and relativism. What is new and different is the note of indignation and alarm that respectably bound books, written by respectable citizens of the academy, should dare to challenge the hallowed dogmas of the academy.

Dr. Strout is not so straightforward as Dr. Black. He is compulsively and nervously concerned with the same phenomenon, but through most of his article, "Liberalism, Conservatism and the Babel of Tongues," he tries to pretend that the specter isn't there. Liberalism, to be sure, isn't doing very well intellectually at the moment; but that is only the result of too much over-confidence, after twenty-five years of power. All that is necessary is to recognize that the nice conservatives are really saying much the same thing as the nice Liberals, and there isn't too much to worry about if the nice conservatives and the nice Liberals would only get together. The pattern for their unity is expressed in practice by the present Supreme Court and the "conservative senators who finally brought McCarthy to book," and is outlined in theory by Edward Shils in his attack upon all security measures, *The Torment of Secrecy*.

There is a danger, of course (life is never safe), but, like the savage who will not give the demon he fears a name, lest it have power over him, Dr. Strout sedulously refuses to name his fears aright. Instead, he adopts the current sociological fashion of attributing all serious opposition to Liberalism to a backwoods "populism," to an unwashed envy and hatred of Eastern Ivy-League Liberals, and thus leaves his argument with an immense empty center. For if it is only the populist mob that is challenging the basic assumptions of Liberalism, why has Liberalism anything to fear intellectually?

His emotion is reserved for the "angry pages of William Buckley's NATIONAL REVIEW." But it is not anger that is upsetting him; there has been for many years an angry opposition to the Establishment. What is disturbing Dr. Strout is the same thing that disturbs Dr. Black, who, more honest or more courageous, refuses to take refuge behind the swirling skirts of sociology. NATIONAL REVIEW, and the movement of thought it represents, has called the Liberals to account in terms that have to be met intellectually—and the Liberal mind, accustomed for years to the unchallenged reign of its dogmas, cannot face the reckoning.

From the Academy

RUSSELL KIRK

Mr. Nixon on the Schools

At Yeshiva University last December, the Vice President of the United States made the first sound remarks on education that have come from the Executive Branch of the federal government since the time of Mr. Herbert Hoover. Mr. Truman, in particular, was in the clutch of the educationists. Mr. Eisenhower, both during his presidency of Columbia University and his presidency of the United States, just hasn't known what's what in education. An officer who had served under him, having acquired after retirement from active duty some knowledge of colleges of pedagogy, went straight to the president of Columbia and inquired, "General Eisenhower, do you know what goes on in our teachers' colleges?" Mr. Eisenhower was genial. "Yes," said he, "I've looked into that, and it's just good Americanism."

But Mr. Nixon seems to be in the know. Take this extract from his Yeshiva address:

> Too often we hear the superficial and pat formula that the answer to all of our problems in the educational field is more classrooms, more teachers, more scholarships, and more scientists. Action on these fronts is essential. But we shall miss the target completely if we do not recognize at the outset that our major problem is quality, not quantity, of education.

So I am inclined to believe that Mr. Nixon, were he President, would have something less than complete confidence in Mr. Marion Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

Mr. Nixon described, and substantially endorsed, three principal criticisms of our schools. First, "There are too many soft subjects and not enough tough, challenging topics that develop the mind." Second, "We do not challenge our superior students. . . . Too many superior students are being lost among the normal and mediocre." Third, "Students are not allowed to face the challenge of failure. Passing is automatic." And he went on to refute the daring claim of the educationists that the principal duty of the schools is "to help students to adjust to one another and to feel the warmth of success."

Opposed NEA Dogmas

It requires courage to say the things that Mr. Nixon said at Yeshiva. The National Education Association is the most powerful lobby in Washington; and the NEA dogmas are the theories Mr. Nixon ventured to oppose. He even stood up for that dreadful authoritarian concept Discipline:

> It is good to have democracy in our educational system, but it is also necessary to have backbone, standards, and guidance. Young people want and need firm guidance. They may rebel against specific commands, but even the brashest of them knows that he has not the experience and the wisdom to face the world unaided. As most parents have learned through experience, true parental love is firm, not indulgent.

Although he gave a mild endorsement to the Administration's program for federal subsidies in aid of scientific studies, he at once qualified this by some wise words:

> Action of this type at the Federal and State level is necessary in serving our immediate national security objectives, but the hundreds of millions of dollars which will be spent on these programs [the NEA demands billions of dollars] will not remove the major weaknesses which exist in our educational system.

Well! Not only is a candidate for the Presidency ready to declare that our schools have major weaknesses, but he observes that these are weaknesses which federal subsidies cannot cure. The approach of the dominant school of educationists, Mr. Nixon said, "does not measure up to the reality of life." Mr. Nixon is not endearing himself to the patronage network of Teachers College, Columbia; but he is heartening a great many really educated people, and a great many parents, I feel sure.

Nor is Mr. Nixon swept along by the present strong current of affection for a purely technological schooling. "We do not want," he says, "an unbalanced warped society which would be the inevitable result if undue emphasis were placed on scientific materialism." And "We must develop teaching scholars, not teaching technicians." (Can Mr. Nixon have been reading Bernard Iddings Bell, Mortimer Smith and Arthur Bestor?)

A few years ago, I am told, the faculty of Duke University voted against giving an honorary degree to the first Duke alumnus to become Vice President of the United States. (Duke has a fairly conservative faculty, as faculties go nowadays, and the majority of the undergraduates there are Republicans — Yankees, many of them; but, after all, Duke is south of Mason's and Dixon's line, and Mr. Nixon was rather an aggressive Republican.) If I were a member of Duke's faculty, I would reconsider that action now, on grounds pedagogical.

A President of the United States who understood the real educational necessities of this country could do much to remedy the defects of our schools, without federal subsidies and federal intervention. He could appoint special educational commissions which, without legislation, could encourage the restoration of decent pedagogical norms; he could reform the federal Office of Education; he could persuade it to publish some really useful pamphlets; he could speak out against educational fads and foibles; he could refuse to be bullied by the hatchetmen of NEA.

Senator Taft said once that businessmen ought to stick to business, and let politicians take care of politics. For my part, I wish that educational administrators would stick to educational "administrating" (their word, not mine), and let legislators make our laws. But I am not at all disinclined to approve of considerable dabbling in the problems of education by an intelligent politician like Mr. Nixon. The educationist hierarchy is bound and determined to make our schools "a national concern." I hope they will approve of Mr. Nixon's concern for their failures.

»BOOKS·ARTS·MANNERS«

Max Lerner's America

RAYMOND ENGLISH

Max Lerner has worked hard for twelve years to write *America as a Civilization: Life and Thought in the United States Today* (Simon and Schuster, $10.00). It is a considerable achievement. So is the reading of it. With all admiration for the author's effort, one must protest on behalf of outraged human nature at one thousand big pages. The sheer stunning bulk of the work makes critical appraisal almost impossible. The subjects covered range from American history, politics and economics to geography, literature, psychology, *mores*, morals, science, technology, class-structure, family life, education, taste, fashion, the press, television and foreign politics. The idea of drawing disciplines together into an "area-study" of America is good, but it makes prolixity, repetition and overlapping inevitable. Dr. Lerner, a good writer and free from sociological jargon, could have boiled all this down to a quarter of its length. If "ideas are weapons," he has converted his sword into a gas-attack.

Why is the book so long? There is only one intelligible explanation of its turgidity: the book must be intended as a text for "Soc. 103" on the campuses of America. In other words, the student in Soc. 103 is going to have his mind and time monopolized by Dr. Lerner; and it is in the light of this probability that the book has to be examined.

It must be pointed out that the whole subject of "Americanism" is controversial, that a book of this size will inevitably overwhelm all but the brightest students by its sheer weight, and that its author's premises will probably go unanalyzed in the anguish of memorization. What are those premises? When a book on civilization devotes formally only fourteen-and-a-half pages out of a thousand to "God and the Churches," one aspect of its bias is obvious. Dr. Lerner would say that this is a fair reflection of the actual influence of religion in American life. Whether this be the truth or not, it will look like the truth to students. Again, underlying the book is an acceptance of the relativistic assumptions of cultural anthropology, and an emphasis on material or comparatively irrational factors in society. Moreover, the author's point of view is steadily and cumulatively that of sentimental Liberalism, expressive of a peculiar mixture of complacency and utopianism.

In a textbook these biases are, it is submitted, objectionable. Dr. Lerner, no doubt, did not intend to produce a propagandist work, but it seems to the present reviewer that he has done so; and that the impact of bias in a huge book of this kind is, in effect, subliminal—that is to say, the student will absorb a whole *Weltanschauung* without being aware of what is happening to him. This criticism is central, if the book is to be considered as a textbook; if it is not to be considered as such, then it is far too long and involuted.

ON PAGES 724-731, Mr. Lerner describes "the three great political angles of vision" in America: the radical, which was a failure; the conservative, which is intellectually disreputable, and the Liberal, which was and is the dominant American attitude, and which assumes that human nature is plastic and endlessly improvable through the organization of majority will. One wonders why the radical is included if the reactionary is to be left out. Was the aim to give a specious appearance of moderation to the Liberal, while the conservative might appear on the extreme right? This may seem a slight point, yet it is characteristic of the whole approach which makes the author's own Liberal assumptions the norm for America.

Typical of his attitude are the sections on "The Disorders of a Society" and "Morals in Revolution." The basic assumption here is that morals are purely relative, so that even when evil results follow from flouting moral principles it may be argued that they are part of the grand experiment of the pursuit of happiness. Thus:

> Most of the phases of social pathology I have listed are the extreme applications of principles which, in lesser degree, may be healthy. . . . The point about the gangster, the racketeer and the syndicate operator . . . is not that they scorn property but that they value it enough to be ruthless in seeking short cuts for making it their own. . . . The adolescent delinquent . . . in the act of rebelling against family or school or community, may be seeking the cherishing love upon which the family and other primary groups must be based.

This is the Liberal faith in the essential goodness of human nature with a vengeance.

> What Americans are suffering is not so much a moral breakdown as . . . a moral interregnum. One king is dead and a new one has not yet been crowned, as with the moral interregnum at the time of the Roman Empire, when the pagan codes had broken down and the Christian codes had not yet been shaped.

This is a revealing comparison, and illustrative of the startling callousness of which the Liberal mind is capable.

Actually, Dr. Lerner's honest analyses of the press, education, family life, juvenile delinquency, mental illness and so forth provide evidence that something is wrong in the liberal-individualistic tradition which he celebrates rhapsodically, that pursuit of happiness is the pursuit of the will-o'-the-wisp, and that restless experiments in morals and education and ways of living place

cruel strains on the individual person. But Dr. Lerner cannot draw the right conclusions from his evidence. Some of the important evidence, indeed, he ignores: for example, the findings on the breakdown of morale among prisoners-of-war in Korea.

One further brief illustration of Dr. Lerner's one-sidedness may be noted. In the long final chapter on "America as a World Power," a major point is made of America's "tradition of revolutionary idealism" as a guide in foreign policy. In other words, presumably, the United States should compete with the Soviet Union in efforts at disturbing the *status quo*. Can this really be the policy of a great commercial and constitutional power?

A MOST DISTURBING feature of Dr. Lerner's assumptions is their unconscious chauvinism. There is no harm in talking of "American Civilization" if it is understood that civilization is a generic term meaning the opposite of barbarism—a condition of civility and decency, in which certain universal moral standards are recognized and to a considerable extent practiced. If this be understood, then America's role as leader of civilization may be responsibly upheld. But Dr. Lerner's attempt to isolate and defend Americanism as *sui generis* is retrogressive.

These remarks expose the point of view from which Dr. Lerner writes. They do not, alas, indicate the vast amount of interesting material and commentary included in his pages. To do justice to the labor and effort of the author would require far more space than is available. As a picture of American society it is, in its many factual and statistical details, reliable and disturbing. In its complacently "progressive" interpretation of the details it is, in the opinion of the present reviewer, out-of-date. As a book aimed at producing in the young reader a stereotype of his country, its morals and its ideals, it appears to be markedly one-sided, as indeed any book written with conviction must be. The question for Professor A, who "adopts" the book as a text, should be how to counterbalance Dr. Lerner, which may be difficult, especially if Professor A happens, as is likely to be the case, to agree with Dr. Lerner.

Mythological Mud Pies

REVILO OLIVER

MR. ROBERT GRAVES, who is best known for novels ranging from realistic pseudo-history (*I, Claudius*) to wild and unearthly fantasies (*Hercules, My Shipmate*), has chosen to write his latest work of fiction under the guise of an ostensibly scholarly work of reference. His *Greek Myths* (Braziller, $4.75) is either a little more or much less than worthless: its slight utility is offset by the danger that uninformed readers may take Mr. Graves seriously.

The book consists of a series of articles, somewhat capriciously arranged, on the principal figures of Greek religion and myth. The first half of each article gives a reasonably accurate, though skeletally dry, summary of ancient traditions, and will not greatly mislead a wary reader who keeps his eye on the footnotes and so distinguishes what was said by classical writers from what was reported or imagined by such late scribblers as Tzetzes, careless and pretentious Byzantine of the twelfth century. If you really want the "retelling of the stories" in the "harmonious narrative" promised by the publisher's blurb, you will have to seek it in such works as Gustav Schwab's *Gods and Heroes,* but if you want merely the kind of information that is given in the standard alphabetical dictionaries of mythology (Who was Clytaemnestra's mother? Who rescued Andromeda?), you can find it, though less conveniently, in this part of Mr. Graves' book. You need observe only one fundamental caution: disregard all of the "translations" of Greek proper names. If you know Greek, the many blunders will annoy you; if you do not, you will put yourself at the mercy of a philological quack.

The second half of each article is devoted to Mr. Graves' private dream-world, which his publisher describes as "the conclusions of modern anthropology and archaeology."

The basis of this pseudo-scientific fiction is a pretense that the Greek myths are to be elucidated by what is known as the "anthropological method." To this there are three major objections: 1) the method is of extremely dubious validity, 2) the results are in any case irrelevant to the subject at hand, and 3) Mr. Graves isn't interested in anthropology anyway.

IN THE HANDS of serious students, such as Jane Harrison, the anthropological method yields a series of interesting but unverifiable hypotheses. The investigator begins with anthropological observations of Bushmen, Hottentots, and other tribes whose capacity for civilization is so low that they have remained savages to our own day. Then, on the assumption that all men are necessarily alike, the theorist uses this data to reconstruct the hypothetical beliefs of the hypothetical ancestors of the Greeks, the uniquely gifted people who created the essentials of Occidental civilization. It is as though one were to reconstruct Shakespeare's boyhood by observing feeble-minded children.

But even if the conclusions were demonstrably correct, they would still, for all practical purposes, be irrelevant. Conjectural origins of rites no more help us to understand the Greeks whom we know, from Homer through Aeschylus and Euripides to Sallustius, than the parallel deduction that the Christian Eucharist was originally a cannibalistic feat helps us to understand the thought of the late Monsignor Knox.

The noble religion of the historical Greeks, which was in its way no less profound than Buddhism or Vedanta and was certainly more beautiful, is often misunderstood by the modern mind because it differed from Christianity in a basic postulate that is sometimes overlooked. Today, both believers and skeptics regard religion as based on historical fact—*e g.*, the Immaculate Conception either did or did not take place—whereas the Greek mind saw no possibility of ascertaining historical facts concerning its gods. There was no revelation and therefore no dogma.

In the Greek mind four distinct concepts took the place of what we regard as theology: 1) religion as a

work of art, *i.e.*, the legitimate exercise of poetic fancy which produced the literary mythology; 2) religion as speculation by the human reason about natural phenomena—a concept already present in Homer, for which see R. K. Hack, *The Concept of God in Greek Philosophy to the Time of Socrates;* 3) religion as civic rites which affirmed participation in a common polity but *not* a common faith; and 4) religion as an irrational emotional experience, particularly for those who chose to be initiated into one or another of the mysteries. The four apparently diverse concepts were united by an underlying piety which is well described in Thaddeus Zielinski's *Religion of Ancient Greece,* and which developed historically in the way described in Gilbert Murray's *Five Stages of Greek Religion.*

After he has buried the poetry and the religion of Greece under the muck that he shovels from the swamps of savagery, Mr. Graves sits down happily to make mud pies. Under his busy fingers anthropology becomes the revelation of a new religion. When he tells us that the *Iliad* is "clearly" religious propaganda produced by "a secret worshiper of the Great Goddess of Asia," he *knows,* for, as he himself tells us in a recently published autobiographical sketch, this Great Goddess not only inspires him but also condignly smites with madness and death publishers who reject Mr. Graves' books. Presumably, therefore, Mr. Graves' august patroness also authorizes his historical absurdities.

As either a cause or a consequence of his new religion, Mr. Graves' mind is haunted by dreams of women such as never existed on this dull planet—massive, fecund, brutal women who, like the female spider, treat the males of their species as inferior animals of merely momentary utility. Accordingly, as Mr. Dick forever saw King Charles' head before him, so Mr. Graves sees everywhere the sacred signs of matriarchy, orgiastic priestesses who rape their male victims, year-kings, and the like. It is, of course, entirely legitimate to purvey such fantasies to those who find them delicious, but to publish them as a handbook with the implication that they are the "results of modern scholarship" is an act of irresponsibility that must excite both wonder and dismay.

To order any book reviewed in this section, write:

THE BOOKMAILER
Box 101, Murray Hill Station
New York 16, N.Y.

Return mail service—postpaid
PAY ONLY BOOKSTORE PRICE

$.....payment enclosed

Please send me: ..... (name of book)

.....

.....

Name .....

Address .....

.....

(No C.O.D. orders accepted; payment MUST accompany order. N.Y. City residents add 3% tax.)

Movies

Two Films from Europe

GARRY WILLS

In photographing Zola's *L'Assomoir,* the men behind *Gervaise* could have stressed either the sweet tale or the sour atmosphere; to have preserved both was an achievement. But they did something more, which no one could reasonably have predicted. They caught the spirit not only of this novelist, but of all the realist-romantics who have dominated modern French letters—a spirit that in Zola, Baudelaire and Gide alike, shows a basic kinship transcending period and school. That is why *Gervaise* is a diabolic movie.

The romantic plot concerns the Woman whose downfall is men whose downfall was drink. The story is advanced by violent and repulsive accidents, fights, rapes, vomitings, delirium and death. The scenic background of the tale—almost, we might say, its plumbing—is made up of the sewers, shops, tables and beds, which are spat, bled, or vomited upon.

But this hard vulgarity and violence in the story's detail are as misleading as the soft sentimentality of its outline; central, and tying the confusion of scenes together, is the Woman's character. Beautifully acted by Maria Schell, Gervaise is the Muse of the French *littérateurs;* she stands for their unhealthy craving to unite the earthy and the ethereal. Beautiful in a clean and stocky peasant's way, but crippled; capable of great love, but seduced from her fifteenth year on, Gervaise is drained, at last, of all beauty and idealism. Yet during her years of struggle and of youth, when there was hope that her noble-hearted lover would get her, she makes a martyr's sufferings part of a woman's seductiveness. No matter how often she falls into bed, she keeps springing up with angelic lightness. Dark Madonna, part angel and part earthworm, she is an old and disillusioned child.

The French do not mix sex and the spirit merely to "get the best of both worlds." There is an unformulated belief back of all this that decadence and holiness somehow go together (as some people continue to insist genius and madness do). The French artist believes that *spiritual* genius is to spiritual maladies near allied; because each touches him with similar intensity—though at the opposite extremities of his spiritual range—he dreams of bringing the two poles together. The halo and the iridescent glow of decay form one aura, and this it is which hangs about the spiritually perceptive, delicate and diabolic literature that found its way onto film in *Gervaise.*

Gervaise is such a *tour de force* of sordidness that one watches it with a certain detachment and clinical interest. *Cabiria,* though a far more improbable tale, involves one's sympathies more directly. Another foreign movie with a woman's soul as its dark nucleus, this portrays an entirely different character. Where Gervaise fascinates, Cabiria can excite nothing but pity. As in *La Strada,* Giulietta Masina plays the *pagliaccio,* the Chaplinesque clown who knows what sadness exists behind the scenes. Here the paint is not that of the traveling circus girl but of the prostitute; yet an intellectual innocence and naiveté —the kind of "holiness" that was at-

tributed to idiocy—keeps her a little girl, a clown who tells the world to laugh while she cries. She has a puppy dog's appeal; she is the poor, unthinking creature capable of vast affections, of conveying great sadness, of sensing human longings and healthy desires, though she may never enter into them or call them hers.

Even dogs dream; we see them running in their sleep. And so the clumsy, winning, large-eyed Cabiria runs across the fields shouting to the Virgin that she will change her life, boasting of her dream-night with a famous actor, claiming she has found a saintly man who *knows* and yet will marry her. The hardened prostitutes weep to see her leave for the paradise of respectable matrimony; her best friend runs beside the bus in her nightgown crying and waving farewell to her. When all her dreams of love crash around her, when her "saint" steals her life's bitter earnings, she collapses into a little ball, whining like a dog, rolling in the dust. She must drag herself back to the "colony," laughed at by the pimps and prostitutes she has left, where sympathy will hurt even more than taunts. And the men bay and howl and bark again around the sad little puppy.

Yet her face still shines, at the end, with that naiveté which will forever be shocked at evil, with the idealism of the classical *pagliaccio*, who expects love to be true and life to have pattern, like a play; whose fierce integrity almost makes us believe that men can die of broken hearts.

In the title role, Giulietta Masina is the same engaging, ingenuous, sexless clown that she was in *La Strada*. Like Chaplin's, her embarrassed and embarrassing grimaces make us uncomfortable, disturb us with an overwhelming pity under laughter. But her bag of tricks is far more limited than Chaplin's. We remember too well the identical appeal and mannerisms of *La Strada*. No *pagliaccio* can construct his whole act out of the sobbing of "Vesti la Giubba"; he must first have the clown's skills and versatility to enforce the *irony* of a harlequin's sufferings. Giulietta Masina seems already to have run out of such comic skills.

BOOKS IN BRIEF

AND THE PRICE IS RIGHT, by Margaret Case Harriman (World, $4.00). Witty and well-paced, Margaret Case Harriman's account of R. H. Macy's and how it grew begins with characters and closes with bureaus. "A stubborn, rosy-cheeked, seafaring Quaker," having failed four times (one account-book ends: "I have worked Two Years for Nothing—Damn. Damn. Damn."), founded the store in 1858; thirty years later Isador and Nathan Straus, German Jewish immigrants who had Macy's china concession, took over and by their showmanship and drive transformed the enterprise (in the words of a buyer) from "an account into a territory." When the American Publishers Association tried to keep the brothers from selling books at a discount, they fought the case to the Supreme Court, and won it. But as Macy's grew, it grew less individualistic. While a price war had once so infuriated a competitor that he published a recriminatory ad which opened with "Some folks are so wrapped up in their own conceit . . .," in 1952 a Gimbel's ad advised the world "to get to Macy's for the greatest flower show 34th Street has ever seen." When the book is done, it no longer describes a territory and its conquerors, but merely the workings of the biggest department store in the world.

M. L. BUCKLEY

THE SHAKESPEAREAN CIPHERS EXAMINED, by William F. and Elizabeth S. Friedman (Cambridge, $5). The people who have seriously believed that the author of Shakespeare's works was other than one extraordinary mortal have always been people who have not read his plays, but merely his words. They could make the same tortuous claims for the Divine Comedy, or the Sermon on the Mount. Their minority is numerous and persistent, however, and the notion that Bacon or some syndicate of Elizabethan cranks wrote the plays—moreover in a secret code—has been scuttling about for a century and a half. Mr. and Mrs. Friedman are professional cryptologists, and their book is an objective examination of all the ciphers proposed. Their conclusions, needless to say, are negative, and though fascinating to anyone who loves ciphers, will adamantly bore anyone who merely loves Shakespeare. R. PHELPS

ENGLISH ECCENTRICS, by Dame Edith Sitwell (Vanguard, $5.00). This is not, as one might have expected, a biography of the Sitwell family, though after Sir Osbert's account of his father Sir George Sitwell one would have been curious to hear Dame Edith's filial impressions. For beside the vast and monumental eccentricity of Sir George, his daughter's present collection of cranks and crackpots is indeed dwarfed. Here is, nevertheless, an entertaining enough assemblage of commonly uncommon English types. Not least is it worth examining because it seems unlikely that the rich moss-bank of English eccentricity will long survive the aridities of the welfare state. Certainly there will be no more Sir Georges with their artificial hard-boiled eggs, nor the lesser loonies that Dame Edith writes about here. In the future most of the eccentrics will head government bureaus, and they will be writing about us. F. RUSSELL

THE WORLD OF DAVID DUBINSKY, by Max D. Danish (World, $4.75). The world of David Dubinsky has yet to materialize. It will be a world much like the one we have now, with this difference: everything in it will be made to bear a union label. So much, at least, is made clear by the author of this plaster-saint portrait of one of America's most powerful and enigmatic men. Mr. Danish's nosegay of obeisances has a rather different odor when read in alternation with Westbrook Pegler's essays on Dubinsky's curious status among American revolutionaries, or alongside this summer's sworn testimony concerning his even more curious relationship with Johnny Dio. C. LOGAN

To the Editor

Misinterpretation

I was startled by the construction put by Mr. Skinner ["To the Editor," February 8] on the last sentence of Mr. Buckley's piece, "The Tranquil World of Dwight D. Eisenhower." It seems to me obvious that Mr. Buckley hopes that Mr. Eisenhower will soon retire to live as a squire in Gettysburg. Correct, Mr. Buckley?

Los Angeles, Cal. J. J. READING

[*Correct*—W.F.B.]

A Republican Choice

A recent item in NATIONAL REVIEW certainly merits laudatory comment: the appeal for direct contributions by conservatives to conservative candidates ["Person to Person," January 25].

Here in New Jersey, as you are aware, we face the unusual possibility of being able to support a *real* Republican candidate for U. S. Senator, Robert Morris. Frankly, this will be a mighty uphill fight against our steadily declining but nonetheless jealously dictatorial Republican state organization. Knowing as I do the caliber of the men in Party power and knowing also the concentration of wealth which they represent, I can't help but feel almost lost in the shuffle.

However, I personally hope to do all one non-wealthy but very interested citizen can do to promote Mr. Morris' candidacy. . . .

Somerville, N. J. WILLIAM C. STRYKER

Profit-Sharing, Perforce!

The answer of the motor moguls to Walter Reuther's plan for profit-sharing in the automobile industry should have been that there is now in effect such a plan in which all corporations, perforce, cooperate. ["Reuther: The Real Answer," January 25.]

The people of the United States are all beneficiaries of this plan, which takes 62 per cent of the profits, excess or otherwise, of all corporations that succeed in making $25,000 or more. To the extent that Mr. Reuther's plan will dip into this fund ahead of the Treasury Department, for the benefit of his union's members, just that much more will have to be shelled out by—I give you one guess whom.

Fort Wayne, Ind. LEON J. BAKER

For a Free Armenia

It is gratifying to note that American scholarship has at last caught up with the merits of the Armenian case, and here is an orchid to James Burnham for putting the Armenians in the front ranks of the 200 million mass population within the Soviet orbit who constitute our most reliable allies in the final showdown. ["Answer to Sputniks," December 14.]

For over forty years, ever since the Soviets violated the independence of Armenia, the Armenians have been assiduously trying to make their voice heard in the world councils that their . . . claim to freedom from the Soviet regime is no less authentic than that of the Polish, the Ukrainians, and the Baltic peoples, despite the fact that their numbers are small, their independence short-lived, and that they have been a forgotten race ever since their betrayal at Lausanne.

Boston, Mass. JAMES G. MANDALIAN

Across the Picket Line

The article in the December 21 issue by Godfrey P. Schmidt, "The Picket Line: Appeal to Prejudice," is one of the most cogent and logically presented articles that I have yet encountered on the subject. Mr. Schmidt and NATIONAL REVIEW are to be commended on their fine presentation—and for the courage to raise their voices above the stentorian cry of "Unfair!" which has become the byword of contemporary unionism.

Kalamazoo, Mich. DAVID SWOAP

Economics Textbooks

I read with interest the article by Leopold Kohr, "How Not to Write On Economics" [December 21]. While this article is mainly directed at reviewing Samuelson's *Economics, An Introductory Analysis,* the spirit of this criticism is broad and is, in fact, generally applicable today as to certain basics.

Yet . . . one cannot help but wonder at the efficacy of subject matter taught over the years to millions of Americans which failed to prevent the conditioning of our country for its loss of freedom. In the several generations prior to the New Deal era the country was conservative [as were] the leaders of both political parties. . . . Must we not ask, what did they conserve? Did they conserve property rights in view of the endless taxes today? Did they conserve freedom from government controls when today the farmers, the very backbone of conservatism, are voting on controls of their affairs by government? In view of these facts did economic education, even of the pre-New Deal era out of which the New Deal came, present the truths of economic science as an objective science?

There is a tendency to shape economics textbooks to conform to custom and tradition rather than to set up as objectively as possible a "cause and effect" or "predictability" pattern of knowledge as is done in other sciences and by which men and women, as citizens, might guide their thinking and actions in politics. . . .

NOAH D. ALPER, President
Public Revenue Education Council

St. Louis, Mo.

I am not an economics major . . . I have used and am now using Professor Samuelson's book. I heartily disagree with Mr. Kohr's criticisms. . . . He states that numerous concepts are "utterly unintelligible" for the beginning student. Neither I nor any other beginning student whom I know has complained of that trouble. . . .

El Paso, Texas JOSEPH E. GOODELL JR.

B.A.'s: America's Strength? II

The January 4 issue contained a letter by Peter Kokalis, which was based in part upon a question posed to a quiz section at Northwestern University. ["Assuming a perfect dichotomy with no other alternative, which would you choose: A war which might destroy civilization as we know it or complete surrender and capitulation to world Communism?"]

It occurred to me that I might well try the same question on a group of thirty-two students who are currently taking a course on "Juvenile Delinquency." You may be interested in noting that exactly half of the respondents indicated their answer as "war."

Brooklyn, N.Y. HERBERT STROUP
Dean of Students, Brooklyn College

Victory for the Worker

Can it be said that the "death" of the *Daily Worker* is an indication of successful penetration of the non-Communist press?

Let me quote a bit from *McCarthyism, The Fight for America,* Chapter XII, page 85. It is from the testimony of Igor Bogolepov, former Colonel in the Red Army.

> Who reads the Communist Papers? Only a few people who are already Communists. We don't need to propagandize them. What is our object? Who do we have to influence? We have to influence non-Communists if we want to make them Communists or if we want to fool them. So we have to try to infiltrate in the big press, to influence millions of people, and not merely hundreds of thousands.
>
> After this argumentation the position was taken that we had to change drastically our policy, as I said before, and do our best in order to carry out the Communist ideas through non-Communist press.

Can it be possible that the *Daily Worker* is no longer needed to twist and distort the news along the Communist Party line? As the seed withers away when the plant has developed roots, so we see the *Daily Worker* "die." It has served its purpose. The roots have been developed.

New York City JOHN F. ROGAN

The Royalist Revival

I have just finished reading Frederick D. Wilhelmsen's excellent article, "Royalist Revival in Central Europe," in the January 18 issue. To Monarchists the world over, beleaguered as they are even by their colleagues within conservative ranks, this masterpiece of political insight came as a breath of fresh air. Ever since the mid-nineteenth century, traditional monarchy has been anathema to "practical political thinkers" and has had to battle the destructive forces of chauvinism and godless materialism. Only recently, an American conservative did not hesitate to equate the Crown with the Red hammer and sickle, as foes of individual liberty. . . .

What Mr. Wilhelmsen has pictured as the pattern for the future United States of Europe will be endorsed, with little variation, by nearly every European traditionalist. However, there is one point on which he makes a major error: he falls for the old mistaken identification of Russia with Soviet imperialism, in speaking of "Russian" satellites and "Russian" aggression, instead of *Soviet* satellites and *Soviet* aggresion. Confusing anti-Russianism with anti-Communism only makes matters worse and alienates our true allies, the Russian anti-Communists.

Mr. Wilhelmsen's evidence of Monarchist resistance in Hungary and other enslaved nations to the Soviet tyranny is heartily welcomed by those people who continually hear the Western governments and press refer to every uprising as inspired by "democratic Socialist" elements.

CHARLES E. WINGENBACH
United States Secretary
The Royal Stuart Society
Washington, D. C.

No Wonder We Are Losing

As Counsel for the U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and similar bodies investigating Communism in the United States during the last seventeen years, Robert Morris has examined more than 500 witnesses under oath.

No other American has interrogated so many informed persons on the subject of the Communist underground and its efforts to undermine the foundations of moral and political authority in the United States.

Robert Morris has just written a book: NO WONDER WE ARE LOSING. In it are his evaluations and conclusions—about use of the Fifth Amendment, America's security system, Communist influence in our schools and in the United Nations, the Yalta Agreement, recent Supreme Court decisions—and glimpses behind official Committee reports.

NO WONDER WE ARE LOSING will provide an incisive understanding of the Soviet enemy.

In order that the maximum number of Americans may read NO WONDER WE ARE LOSING, we have published it at the minimum possible price: paper bound, 230 pages, $2.50, postage prepaid.

NO WONDER WE ARE LOSING

$2.50—postage prepaid, from

THE BOOKMAILER

Box 101, New York 16, N.Y.

(offices at 209 East 34 St., New York City—the complete bookstore-by-mail)